



Docket No.: 266491US2PCT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

SURINDER SACHAR
(703) 413-3000
SSACHAR@OBLON.COM

MICHAEL BRITTON
(703) 413-3000
MBRITTON@OBLON.COM

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/525,799

Applicants: Daisuke YAMADA, et al.

Filing Date: February 25, 2005

For: ANISOTROPIC CONDUCTIVE CONNECTOR AND
PRODUCTION METHOD THEREFOR AND
INSPECTION UNIT FOR CIRCUIT DEVICE

Group Art Unit: 2829

Examiner: ISLA RODAS, R.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

Restriction Response

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Surinder Sachar

Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Michael Britton

Registration No. 47,260

DOCKET NO: 266491US2PCT



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
DAISUKE YAMADA, ET AL. : EXAMINER: ISLA RODAS, R.
SERIAL NO: 10/525,799 :
FILED: FEBRUARY 25, 2005 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2829
FOR: ANISOTROPIC CONDUCTIVE :
CONNECTOR AND PRODUCTION
METHOD THEREFOR AND INSPECTION
UNIT FOR CIRCUIT DEVICE

RESTRICTION RESPONSE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Office Action dated December 23, 2005, Applicants provisionally elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 1-10 and 12-14 for further examination on the merits in the present application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction and election requirement because the PTO has not carried forward its burden of proof to establish that searching and examining both of the noted sets of claims would be an undue burden.

In particular, M.P.E.P. §803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the outstanding restriction and election requirement on grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Surinder Sachar
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
MB/rac

Michael Britton
Registration No. 47,260

I:\ATTY\MB\266491US-RESPONSE.DOC